



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 28, 2007

Ms. April M. Virnig  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
I-30 at Bryant-Irvin Road  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2007-12623

Dear Ms. Virnig:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 290683.

The Haltom City Police Department (the "department") received a request for copies of all letters issued by the department chief to department officers participating in a motorcycle leasing program and the names of all officers who received the letters, including the officers' job titles at the time they received the letters. You state the department released documents that may contain some of the information responsive to the second part of the request. You also state that you only maintain one letter responsive to the first category of the request. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state that a complaint was filed against the department chief that has resulted in a Texas Rangers criminal investigation. You also state that the individual who made the complaint has retained an attorney and that this attorney has threatened to sue the department on charges of retaliation and harassment stemming from the initial complaint. Further, you

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

provide us with copies of correspondence sent from this attorney where he threatens to initiate legal action against Haltom City (the “city”) and the department. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted documents, we conclude that, for purposes of section 552.103, you have established litigation was reasonably anticipated when the city received the request for information. You also state that the letter responsive to the request “relates to litigation of a criminal nature” to which the department chief may be a party. However, the anticipated litigation, which the complainant’s attorney threatens, relates to a civil cause of action. You do not provide any arguments explaining how the submitted letter is related to the anticipated lawsuit regarding retaliation and harassment. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate how the submitted letter is related to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the submitted letter under section 552.103.

Next, we address your claims under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to an investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body possesses information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the governmental body agency may withhold the information under section 552.108 if (1) it demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and (2) this office is provided with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information. You state that the Texas Rangers are currently conducting a criminal investigation into allegations of misconduct against the department chief. You also state that the investigator handling this matter stated that the release of information held by the city related to the criminal allegations would interfere with the on-going investigation. However, you do not provide a representation from the Texas Rangers, who are conducting the investigation, that the letter is related to the criminal allegations and that release will interfere with their criminal investigation of the department chief. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) to the submitted letter. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the letter under section 552.108. As you claim no other exception to disclosure, the letter must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited

from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



M. Alan Akin  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAA/mcf

Ref: ID# 290683

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Kirsch  
Fort Worth Star-Telegram  
P.O. Box 915007  
Fort Worth, Texas 76115  
(w/o enclosures)